1				
1	Lisa McMahon-Myhran Robinson Tait, P.S.			
2	710 Second Avenue, Suite 710			
3	Seattle, WA 98104			
4	Phone: (206) 676-9640 Facsimile: (206) 676-9659			
5				
6	Attorneys for Defendant Fremont Reorganizing C	ompany		
7				
8	IN THE UNITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE DISTRIC	CT OF OREGON		
10	JUSTIN JAMES and NICOLE JAMES,			
11	Plaintiffs,	Case No. 3:08-CV-397-BR		
12	vs.			
13	FREMONT REORGANIZING COMPANY, fka	FREMONT REORGAINIZING		
14	FREMONT INVESTMENT & LOAN	COMPANY'S ANSWER AND		
15	COMPANY, a California Corporation; BRIDGE CAPITAL CORPORATION, a California	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT		
16	Corporation, HSBC BANK USA, NA, a national banking association			
17	banking association			
18	Defendants.			
19	COMES NOW Fremont Reorganizing Co	ompany ("Fremont"), Defendant, in answer to		
20	Plaintiffs' amended complaint, admits, denies and	alleges as follows:		
21	1.1 Fremont is without knowledge or in	oformation sufficient to form a belief as to the		
22				
23	truth of the allegations of paragraph 1 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies			
24	those allegations.			
25	1.2 Answering paragraph 3, Fremont a	dmits that this court has jurisdiction.		
26	1.3 Fremont admits that the Jameses are natural persons who own real property			
27	1.5 Premont admits that the Jameses are natural persons who own real property			
28	FREMONT REORGANIZING COMPANY'S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES	Law Offices		

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	u

27

located at 4063 43<sup>rd</sup> St. NE, Neotsu, OR and 2125 NE 21<sup>st</sup>, Lincoln City, OR. Fremont is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remainder of the allegations of paragraph 3 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies those allegations.

- 1.4 Answering paragraph 4, Fremont admits the same.
- 1.5 Fremont admits that Defendant Bridge Capital Corporation is a corporation that was licensed as an Oregon mortgage broker or banker. Fremont is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remainder of the allegations of paragraph 5 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies those allegations.
- 1.6 Answering paragraph 6 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Fremont is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations, and therefore denies those allegations.
- 1.7 Answering paragraph 7 of plaintiffs' Amended complaint, Fremont admits that it is a creditor under TILA and Regulation Z. Fremont denies the remainder of any other allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the Amended Complaint.
- 1.8 Answering paragraph 8 of plaintiffs' Amended complaint, Fremont denies the same.
- 1.9 No answer is required from Fremont as to paragraph 9 of plaintiff's Amended complaint. To the extent that any answer is required, Fremont denies any factual allegations as to Fremont contained in paragraph 9 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.
  - 1.10 Fremont is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the

FREMONT REORGANIZING COMPANY'S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 2 60176-0055-JUD-2

Law Offices
ROBINSON TAIT, P.S.

A Professional Service Corporation

1	tr
2	th
3	
4	
5	tr
6	th
7	
8	tr
9	
10	th
11	
12	tr
13	th
14	
15	
16	lo
17	tr
18	th
19	
20	
21	th
22	al
23	
24	it
25	
26	re
27	al

truth of th	ne allegations of	paragraph	10 of Plaintiffs'	Amended	Complaint	and therefore	denies
those alle	gations.						

- 1.11 Fremont is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 11 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies those allegations.
- 1.12 Fremont is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 12 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and therefore denies those allegations.
- 1.13 Fremont is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 13 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, and therefore denies those allegations.
- 1.14 Fremont admits only that loan applications were received by Fremont prior to the loans' closing. Fremont is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remainder of the allegations of paragraph 14 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, and therefore denies those allegations.
- 1.15 Answering paragraph 15 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Fremont admits only that Bridge was the mortgage broker on these loans. Fremont denies the remainder of the factual allegations contained in paragraph 15.
- 1.16 Answering paragraph 16 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Fremont admits that it set its own approval conditions for plaintiffs' loans, participated in underwriting them and reviewed plaintiffs' loan applications. Fremont denies the remainder of any other factual allegations contained in paragraph 16.

28 || FREMONT REORGANIZING COMPANY'S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES
TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 3
60176-0055-JUD-2

ROBINSON TAIT, P.S.

60176-0055-JUD-2

1	1.17 Answering paragraph 17 of plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Fremont admits the
2	same.
3	1.18 Answering paragraph 18 of plaintiffs' Amended complaint, Fremont repeats and
4	
5	incorporates by its answers in all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
6	1.19 Answering the entirety of paragraph 19, including paragraphs 19A through 19D
7	of plaintiff's Amended complaint, Fremont denies the same.
8	1.20 Fremont is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
9	truth of the allegations of paragraph 20, including paragraphs 20A and 20B, of Plaintiffs'
11	Amended Complaint, and therefore denies those allegations.
12	1.21 Answering paragraph 21 of plaintiff's Amended complaint, Fremont denies the
13	1.21 Miswering paragraph 21 of plantiff s Amended complaint, Fremont defices the
14	same.
15	1.22 Answering the entirety of paragraph 22 of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint,
16	including paragraphs 22A through 22D, Fremont denies the same.
17	1.23 Answering paragraph 23 of plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Fremont denies the
18	same.
19	1.24 A a consider a consideration of a latinification of the consideration of the considerati
20	1.24 Answering paragraph 24 of plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Fremont denies the
21	same.
22	1.25 Answering paragraph 25 of plaintiffs' Amended complaint, Fremont repeats and
23	incorporates its answers in all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
24	1.26 No answer is required to paragraph 26 of Plaintiffs' Amended complaint as these
25	
26	allegations are against Defendant Bridge only.
27	
28	FREMONT REORGANIZING COMPANY'S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES  Law Offices

1	1.27 Fremont denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to the relief requested in paragraph 27					
2	of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.					
3 4	1.28 Answering paragraph 28 of plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Fremont repeats and					
5	incorporates its answers in all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.					
6	1.29 Answering paragraph 29 of plaintiffs' Amended complaint, Fremont admits the					
7	same.					
8 9	1.30 Answering paragraph 30 of plaintiffs' Amended complaint, Fremont denies the					
10	same.					
11	1.31 Answering paragraph 31 of plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Fremont admits that					
12	plaintiffs sent Fremont a letter dated February 26, 2008 and that the letter speaks for itself.					
13	Fremont denies the remainder of the allegations in paragraph 31 of Plaintiffs' Amended					
14 15	Complaint, for lack of knowledge.					
16	1.32 Fremont denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to the relief requested in paragraph 32,					
17	including paragraphs 32A through 32 C of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.					
18	1.33 Fremont denies the Plaintiffs' prayers for relief in their entirety.					
19						
20	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES					
21						
22	FURTHER ANSWERING and by way of affirmative defense, Fremont alleges as					
23	follows:					
24	2.1 The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.					
25 26	2.2 Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doctrine of estoppel.					
27	2.3 Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doctrine of waiver.					
28	FREMONT REORGANIZING COMPANY'S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES  Law Offices					

TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 5 60176-0055-JUD-2

ROBINSON TAIT, P.S.

1	2.4	Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doc	trine of voluntary payment.				
2	2.5	Plaintiffs' damages, if any, are the resu	alt of plaintiffs' own acts or omissions in				
3	failing to take reasonable steps to protect their own interests.						
4		• •					
5	2.6	That Plaintiffs have failed to mitigate t	heir damages, if any.				
6	2.7	That Plaintiffs' damages, if any, were	caused by the acts or omissions of parties				
7	other than F	Fremont and Fremont places the liability of	of those parties at issue for the purposes of				
8	determining	comparative fault.					
9 10	The	above defenses and affirmatives defenses	s are based on the facts currently known to				
11	Fremont. Fr	remont reserves the right to amend or add	defenses or affirmative defenses based on				
12	facts later di	iscovered, pled or offered.					
13			ATN				
14		COUNTERCI	LAIM				
15	FUR	RTHER ANSWERING and by way of cou	unter claim, Fremont alleges as follows:				
16	3.1	That the notes and deed of trusts in ques	tion provide for reimbursement of attorneys				
17	fees and cos	ets incurred in defending Fremont's rights	s in the property foreclosed.				
18	3.2	That Fremont should be reimbursed their	attorneys fees and costs incurred in				
19	defense of the	his case.					
20		RESERVATION OF COUNTERC	I AIMC/CDOCC CLAIMC				
21		AND THIRD-PART					
22	4.1	Defendant Fremont Reorganizing Cor	npany hereby reserves the right to bring any				
23							
24	additional co	ounterclaims, cross-claims, and/or third-p	party claims against any party hereto.				
25		PRAYER FOR 1	RELIEF				
26	WHI	EREFORE, having fully answered plain	tiff's complaint the Fremont prays for relies				
27	as follows:						
28	FREMONT	REORGANIZING COMPANY'S	Law Offices				

TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 6

60176-0055-JUD-2

ROBINSON TAIT, P.S.

1	5.1	That Plaintiffs' complaint be dismissed with prejudice;
2	5.2	That Fremont be awarded reimbursement of its attorneys fees and costs incurred in
3	this case;	
4	5.3	That the court grant such other and further relief as the court may deem just.
5		
6	DA	TED this 13th day of April, 2009.
7		/s/ Lisa McMahon-Myhran
8		Lisa McMahon-Myhran, OSB #00084
9		ROBINSON TAIT, P.S. Attorneys for Defendant Fremont Reorganizing Company
11		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
17		
8		
9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
ו אי	1	

28 || FREMONT REORGANIZING COMPANY'S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 7 60176-0055-JUD-2

Law Offices ROBINSON TAIT, P.S.

Case 3:08-cv-00397-BR	Document 27	Filed 04/13/2009	Page 8 of 8
-----------------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

	CERT			$\sim$ r		TITAL
1		11416 7	<b>1 I H</b>	( ) H	$\times$ HV	V 11 H

2

3

4

5

6

1

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ON April 13, 2009, I served a true and correct copy of the attached DEFENDANT FREMONT REORGANIZING COMPANY'S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT, by MAIL to the attorneys whose address appears below:

7

8

9

Hope A. Del Carlo 921 SW Washington, Suite 516 Portland, OR 97205

10

11

Mark E. Griffin R. Bradley Griffin Griffin & McCandlish 215 SW Washington St., Suite 202 Portland, OR 97202

12 13

Of Attorneys for Plaintiffs

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

Dated this 13th day of April, 2009

By:/s/ Lisa McMahon-Myhran

Lisa McMahon-Myhran Robinson Tait, P.S. 710 Second Avenue, Suite 710 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 676-9640

Of Attorneys for Defendants